



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/960,548  | 09/20/2001    | Tomohiro Igakura     | P/1866-65               | 5904             |
| 7590 04/30/2004   |               |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| STEVEN I. WEISBURD<br>DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP<br>1177 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS<br>41st FLOOR |               |                      | CHEN, TE Y              |                  |
|   |               |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |               |                      | 2171                    |                  |
| NEW YORK,,  | NY 10036-2714 |                      | DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004 | 12               |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  | 19U  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
| •   | 09/960,548   | IGAKURA, TOMOHIRO  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Susan Y Chen   | 2171   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communicate Period for Reply   | tion appears on the cover sheet w  | vith the correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 33 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) de  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | TION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a ation. 9 s, a reply within the statutory minimum of third period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO by statute, cause the application to become A | reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed o   | n <u>21 September 2001</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)  | $oxed{oxed}$ This action is non-final.   |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice to   | under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I  | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the appl   | lication.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v  | vithdrawn from consideration.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   | Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction  | n and/or election requirement.   | ·  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the E   | xaminer.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  | ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to   | by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection  | n to the drawing(s) be held in abeya   | nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the  | correction is required if the drawing  | g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |  |  |  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by  | the Examiner. Note the attache   | d Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc   |  | § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority doc   | cuments have been received in  | Application No   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the  | he priority documents have beer  | n received in this National Stage  |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International  | Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for   | or a list of the certified copies no   | t received.  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  | 001.   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |  | WU .   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   |  | Summary (PTO-413)  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO</li> </ul>  | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5</u> .  | 6) Other:  |  |  |  |  |  |

Page 2

Art Unit: 2171

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This office action is in responsive to the pre-amendment filed on 09/21/2001.

Claims 1-17 are presented for examination; claims 4, 10, 11 have been preamended, and claims 13-17 are newly added.

### Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.

#### Claim Objections

Claims 8 and 9 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claim 8, there is a typing error in line 7, the phrase "he files" should be changed to "the files".

As to claim 9, there is a missing blank in line 9, the phrase "IC" should be changed to "ID".

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2171

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 1, 2, 3, the repeatedly usage of the phrase "a means" renders these claims to be indistinct, since it is unclear whether the claimed phrase represents a single mean or multiple means. Furthermore, the lacking of indentation and misuse of punctuation in the lengthy claims 2 and 3 makes it very difficult to determine exactly which units are included to which units and which units perform which functions.

As to claims 8 (lines 17-18) and 9 (lines 9-10), it is unclear what does "a correspondence table" refer to [i.e., Does it refer to one of the retrieved hash tables? How to identify a correspondence table from the retrieved hash tables as claimed?]

As to the claims 4-6, 10-11 and 13-17, these claims have the same defects as their base claims, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Because of the ambiguous nature of the invention, the following art rejections are based on the examiner's best understanding.

Art Unit: 2171

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3, 7 and 12, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,560,631 issued to Ishihara et al. (hereinafter referred as Ishihara).

As to claims 1 and 7, Ishihara discloses a file management system with means and method to manage files comprising:

managing a plurality of files having the same file title but different contents as separate files [e.g., col. 6, lines 21-26]; and

managing a plurality of files have the same content as a single file [Note: a single file has the same content is the default nature of a file, thus, any file management mean reads this claimed feature].

As to claims 2-3 and 12, Ishihara discloses a file management system [e.g. col. 2, lines 15-36] with means and method to perform the following steps as claimed by applicant:

Art Unit: 2171

a) a GUI interface [e.g., the GUI interface of each terminal station at col. 9, lines 39-42] coupled to the data processor [e.g., the Process Execution Unit 3, Fig. 1] and system users, wherein, the GUI interface in response to the user's request / input will register or retrieve registered files [e.g., col. 12, lines 1-7, Fig. 8, col. 11, lines 54-61; Fig. 15 and associated text];

- b) a memory unit including a correspondence table [e.g., the tables: 172aa, Fig. 9, 172ab, Fig. 10, 172ac, Fig. 11], in which correspondence relationships of file titles, file ID and managing IDs are recorded [e.g., col. 9, lines 55 col. 10, line 32]; and a file memory [e.g., the Cache management table 173a, Fig. 12], in which managing IDs and files are recorded [col. 10, lines 42-49];
- c) a data processor [e.g., the process execution unit 3, Fig. 1, the multiprocessors, col. 5, lines 9-14] including:

means for producing a new managing ID [e.g., see the three-level standard data creating processes, Fig. 4] and registering, in the file memory, the new managing ID and a file to be registered [e.g., Fig.(s) 4-6 and associated texts, col. 12, lines 1 - 16];

means for deleting the managing ID and the registered file from the file storage for duplicated files [col. 2, lines 8-10, col. 4, lines 3-22, S41-S43, Fig. 19; col. 14, lines 39-46];

means for retrieving the file memory with managing IDs to get corresponding files [e.g., col. 2, lines 29-36, Fig. 20 and associated texts];

Art Unit: 2171

means for sending the obtained files to a file output unit [e.g., the CORBA architecture, col. 11, lines 54-57];

means for comparing a file content to be registered with the registered file in the memory [e.g., col. 13, lines 12-16];

means for registering the file ID, file title and new managing Ids [e.g., the step S1, Fig. 15];

means for updating a correspondence table, if a same content file has been registered in the memory [e.g., col. 12, lines 1-16; col. 13, lines 19-28]; means for retrieving a corresponding table [e.g., the created link of 172a, 173a, S32, Fig. 18; col. 14, lines 47-55];

d) the file output unit sending out, to the file request input unit, the file corresponding to the requested file title and ID from the input unit as delivered from the data processor [e.g., col. 10, lines 33 – 41].

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 8-11 and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6.560.631 issued to Ishihara et al. (hereinafter

Art Unit: 2171

referred as Ishihara), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,109,511 issued to Nitta et al. (hereinafter referred as Nitta).

As to claims 4 and 13, Ishihara discloses all the features as recited in claims 2 and 3, except he fails to specifically teach the memory unit including hash tables in which relationships of hash value of files and managing IDs are recorded, such that the processor can use the hash table to retrieve, register and verify the contents of the associated files as claimed by applicant.

However, Nitta discloses a memory unit including hash tables as claimed by applicant for a multi-task processor [col. 3, line 40-45] to manipulating the associated data elements in file system as claimed by applicant [e.g., Abstract, the unit 20, Fig. 1; Fig.(s) 4-12 and associated texts].

Therefore, with the teachings of Ishihara and Nitta in front of him/her, an ordinary skilled artisan at the time the invention was made would be movitated to modify the file management system Ishihara with the hash tables as taught by Nitta, because by doing so, the combined system processor will be able to management of data suitable for high-speed access to a large quantity of files without lock operation under the multiprocessor environment or the multi-task processing environment [e.g., Nitta: Abstract, lines 14-18]. Furthermore, the use of counter data hold in the hash tables for confirming that during the processing of registration of a certain data element by a

Art Unit: 2171

certain process the processing of registration of another data element having the same home position as the certain data element is not performed in parallel by another process. The provision of the registration counter makes it possible to prevent double registration of the same data element into the hash table. Also, since one registration counter is provided not for the whole of the hash table but for each table entry, the probability of occurrence of collision in access to the registration counter can be reduced [Nitta: col. 2, lines 16 - 42].

As to claims 5 and 14, the combined system discloses all the features as claimed in claims 4 and 13, it further discloses that the hash tables are each provided for each file title, and the hash table retrieving means decides, if no same title file as the file title of the any retrieved file has been registered in the file memory, that no hash table retrieval result is present, and retrieves, if a same title file has been registered in the file memory, the hash table corresponding to the file title of the same title file with the hash value of the pertinent file to be registered used as a key value [e.g., Nitta: Fig. 12 and associated text].

As to claim 6 and 15, the combined system discloses all the features as claimed in claims 4 and 13, the combined system further discloses that only a single hash table is provided for all file titles [e.g., the hash table 30, Fig. 1].

Art Unit: 2171

As to claims 8-11 and 9-16, these claims recited the same subject matters as claims 2-6 and 13-15 in form of method, since the features of these claims have been disclosed or suggested by the combined system as discussed above, hence these claims are rejected for the same reason.

#### .Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Gupta et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,546,405) disclosed an annotating of temporally-dimensioned multimedia system processing with a GUI for an end user to manage the multimedia files; Inokuchi et al. (U.S. patent No. 6,144,969) disclosed a file name conversion system for converting a first file name into a second file name, such that the converted file name can be distinguished by any operating system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

Art Unit: 2171

Page 10

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

> Susan Y Chen Examiner Art Unit 2171

April 20, 2004

PRIMARY EXAMINER